UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,942	09/19/2003	Peng Wang	09282.0047-00	8436

22852   7590   08/31/2007

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
CAO, PHUONG THAO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/666,942	WANG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phuong-Thao Cao	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _19 June 2007_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _31-54_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _31-54_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20070823

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to Amendment filed on 6/19/2007.

2.   Claims 31, 38, 45 and 52 have been amended; and claims 1-30 were previously

cancelled. Currently, claims 31-54 are pending.

Response to Amendment

3.   Amendments to claims 38 and 45 are effective to overcome claim objections in the

previous office action. Therefore, claim objections have been withdrawn.

4.   Amendment to the Specification is effective to overcome the 101 rejection in the

previous office action. Therefore, the 101 rejection has been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed on 6/19/2007 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Goerke et al. does not teach or suggest extracting

valid content data from the update record, Examiner disagrees. Goerke et al. discloses in p. 16,

para. 1, that data is extracted and sent from one entity to another entity wherein each entity (i.e.,

company, administrator, broker) represents a computer system with a database to store data. The exchanged data also includes updated data (see Goerke et al., p. 17, para. 2 and 4) wherein the updated data must be extracted from the updated record of the employee (e.g., Participant) stored in the company's information system (database) in order to send as disclosed, and wherein the updated data reflecting the current data is interpreted as valid data.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Goerke et al. does not teach or suggest extracting valid content data having a validity period including the predetermined time, Examiner disagrees. Based on the Schema Diagram in p. 25, Goerke et al. discloses a validity period (represented by values of validFrom and validTo) associated with WorkLocation, which suggests that when a current work location information is requested at the current time, the work location information extracted must have the validity period including the current time.

Regarding Applicant's argument that there is no motivation to combine the teaching of Hansek with Goerke et al., Examiner disagrees. Both of the references (Goerke et al. and Hansek) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, data management system including exchanging data between multiple systems, databases, updating one database using data extracted from another system, XML, etc. This close relation highly suggests an expectation of success. Although all parties in the Goerke et al.'s system are compatible to exchange data, adding the features of Hanzek provides an effective way to communicate with internal systems using internal document inside each party.

Regarding Applicant's statement that Applicants disagree with the Examiner's assertion

that Hanzek teaches or suggests "producing an internal document..." or "producing a file based

on the internal document", this statement is not a valid argument.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 31-54 (effective filing date 09/19/2003) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Goerke et al. (Employee Stock Plans Interface 1.0 Recommendation,

October 2002) in view of Hanzek (US Patent No 6,980,963, effective filing data 03/29/2000).

As to claim 31, Goerke et al. teaches:

"A method for updating a record stored in a database and transmitting valid content data

as of the time of transmission, the record including a plurality of content data and a validity

period associated with each of the plurality of content data" (see Goerke et al., Diagram on page

13, [page 15, paragraph 1 and 5], [page 16, paragraph 1 and 2] and [page 17, paragraph 2]

wherein inception data combined with end data creates a validity period for a Plan data and

Human Resource Information System must include a database to maintain data as disclosed),

comprising:

"receiving a notification regarding a change in a validity period of at least one of the

plurality of content data of the record" (see Goerke et al., [page 17, paragraph 4, 5 and 7] for the

notification of change such as terms of the grant which is considered as validity period of the

grant);

"updating, based on the notification, the record by changing the validity period for one of

the plurality of content data" (see Goerke et al., [page 17, paragraph 2 and 7] wherein the change

from the original expiration data to another data as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant's

"changing the validity period");

"extracting, at a predetermined time, valid content data from the updated record, the valid

content data corresponding to content data having a validity period including the predetermined

time" (see Goerke et al., [page 16, paragraph 1, 4, 7 and 8], and [page 17, paragraph 1 and 2]

wherein terms of the grant such as vesting or expiration is equivalent to Applicant's "validity

period including the predetermined time); and

"sending the file at the predetermined time" (see Goerke et al., [page 19, paragraph 1],

[page 17, paragraph 1, 2, 6] and [page 16, paragraph 4 and 8]).

However, Goerke et al. does not teach:

"producing an internal document that includes the valid content data extracted from the

updated record"; and

"producing a file based on the internal document that includes the valid content".

On the other hand, Hanzek teaches:

"producing an internal document that includes the valid content data extracted from the updated record" (see Hanzek, [column 25, lines 55-67] and [column 26, lines 1-10] wherein a comma delimited flat file is equivalent to Applicant's "internal document"); and

"producing a file based on the internal document that includes the valid content" (see [column 26, lines 1-25] wherein an XML message or the converted file is equivalent to Applicant' "file").

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Goerke et al. by the teaching of Hanzek to add the features of producing an internal document and producing a file based on the internal document since these features provides an effective way to transfer data between different systems support different transport communication mechanisms (see Hanzek, [column 26, lines 10-16]).

As to claim 38, Goerke et al. teaches:

"A computer program product, tangibly embodied on a computer-readable medium, for updating a record stored in a database and transmitting valid content data as of the time of transmission, the record including a plurality of content data and a validity period associated with each of the plurality of content data" (see Goerke et al., Diagram on page 13, [page 15, paragraph 1 and 5], [page 16, paragraph 1 and 2] and [page 17, paragraph 2] wherein inception data combined with end data creates a validity period for a Plan data and Human Resource Information System must include a computer program and a database to process and maintain data as disclosed), the computer program product storing instructions for execution by a machine to:

"receive a notification regarding a change in a validity period of at least one of the plurality of content data of the record" (see Goerke et al., [page 17, paragraph 4, 5 and 7] for the notification of change such as terms of the grant which is considered as validity period of the grant);

"update, based on the notification, the record by changing the validity period for one of the plurality of content data" (see Goerke et al., [page 17, paragraph 2 and 7] wherein the change from the original expiration data to another data as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant's "changing the validity period");

"extract, at a predetermined time, valid content data from the updated record, the valid content data corresponding to content data having a validity period including the predetermined time" (see Goerke et al., [page 16, paragraph 1, 4, 7 and 8], and [page 17, paragraph 1 and 2] wherein terms of the grant such as vesting or expiration is equivalent to Applicant's "validity period including the predetermined time); and

"sending the file at the predetermined time" (see Goerke et al., [page 19, paragraph 1], [page 17, paragraph 1, 2, 6] and [page 16, paragraph 4 and 8]).

However, Goerke et al. does not teach:

"produce an internal document that includes the valid content data extracted from the updated record"; and

"produce a file based on the internal document that includes the valid content".

On the other hand, Hanzek teaches:

"producing an internal document that includes the valid content data extracted from the updated record" (see Hanzek, [column 25, lines 55-67] and [column 26, lines 1-10] wherein a comma delimited flat file is equivalent to Applicant's "internal document"); and

"producing a file based on the internal document that includes the valid content" (see Hanzek, [column 26, lines 1-25] wherein an XML message or the converted file is equivalent to Applicant' "file").

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Goerke et al. by the teaching of Hanzek to add the features of producing an internal document and producing a file based on the internal document since these features provides an effective way to transfer data between different systems support different transport communication mechanisms (see Hanzek, [column 26, lines 10-16]).

As to claim 45, Goerke et al. teaches:

"A system for updating a record stored in a database and transmitting valid content data as of the time of transmission, the record including a plurality of content data and a validity period associated with each of the plurality of content data" (see Goerke et al., Diagram on page 13, [page 15, paragraph 1 and 5], [page 16, paragraph 1 and 2] and [page 17, paragraph 2] wherein inception data combined with end data creates a validity period for a Plan data and Human Resource Information System must include a database to maintain data as disclosed), comprising:

"a company including a computer system" (see Goerke et al., [page 16, paragraph 1]) that:

"receives a notification regarding a change in a validity period of at least one of the plurality of content data of the record" (see Goerke et al., [page 17, paragraph 4, 5 and 7] for the notification of change such as terms of the grant which is considered as validity period of the grant);

"updates, based on the notification, the record by changing the validity period for one of the plurality of content data" (see Goerke et al., [page 17, paragraph 2 and 7] wherein the change from the original expiration data to another data as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant's "changing the validity period");

"extracts, at a predetermined time, valid content data from the updated record, the valid content data corresponding to content data having a validity period including the predetermined time" (see Goerke et al., [page 16, paragraph 1, 4, 7 and 8], and [page 17, paragraph 1 and 2] wherein terms of the grant such as vesting or expiration is equivalent to Applicant's "validity period including the predetermined time); and

"sending the file at the predetermined time" (see [page 19, paragraph 1], [page 17, paragraph 1, 2, 6] and [page 16, paragraph 4 and 8]).

However, Goerke et al. does not teach:

"produce an internal document that includes the valid content data extracted from the updated record"; and

"produce a file based on the internal document that includes the valid content".

However, Hanzek teaches:

"producing an internal document that includes the valid content data extracted from the updated record" (see Hanzek, [column 25, lines 55-67] and [column 26, lines 1-10] wherein a comma delimited flat file is equivalent to Applicant's "internal document"); and

"producing a file based on the internal document that includes the valid content" (see Hanzek, [column 26, lines 1-25] wherein an XML message or the converted file is equivalent to Applicant' "file").

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Goerke et al. by the teaching of Hanzek to add the features of producing an internal document and producing a file based on the internal document since these features provides an effective way to transfer data between different systems support different transport communication mechanisms (see Hanzek, [column 26, lines 10-16]).

As to claims 32, 39 and 46, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 31, 38 and 45 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Georke et al. and Hanzek teach:

"wherein the file includes Extensible Markup Language" (see Goerke et al., Abstract and Appendix C [page 49]).

As to claims 33, 40 and 47, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 31, 38 and 45 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Georke et al. and Hanzek teach:

"wherein the change in the validity period includes extending a time period in which the record content is valid" (see <u>Goerke et al.</u>, [page 20] and [page 21] for the attributes "validFrom" and "validTo" of the record content "StockPlan", the inclusion of these attributes allows the change in the validity period including extending a time period as illustrated in <u>Applicant</u>'s claim language).

As to claims 34, 41 and 48, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 31, 38 and 45 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

<u>Georke et al.</u> and <u>Hanzek</u> teach:

"wherein the change in the validity period includes shortening a time period in which the record content is valid" (see <u>Goerke et al.</u>, [page 20] and [page 21] for the attributes "validFrom" and "validTo" of the record content "StockPlan", the inclusion of these attributes allows the change in the validity period including shortening a time period as illustrated in <u>Applicant</u>'s claim language).

As to claims 35, 42 and 49, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 31, 38 and 45 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

<u>Georke et al.</u> and <u>Hanzek</u> teach:

"wherein the record includes information associated with a participant of a stock option program" (see <u>Goerke et al.</u>, [page 15, paragraph 5-8]).

As to claims 36, 43 and 50, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for

rejected claims 31, 38 and 45 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Georke et al. and Hanzek teach:

"wherein the record includes information associated with stock option granted in a stock

option program" (see Goerke et al., [page 15, paragraph 1 and 2] and [page 16, paragraph 1, 5-

8]).

As to claims 37, 44 and 51, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for

rejected claims 31, 38 and 45 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Georke et al. and Hanzek teach:

"repeating at least the step of extracting, producing the internal document, producing the

file, and sending at a second predetermined time" (see Goerke et al., [page 16, paragraph 1-4]

and [page 19, paragraph 1]).

As to claim 52, Georke et al. teach:

"A method for updating a record stored in a database and transmitting valid content data

as of the time of transmission, the record including at least one content data and a validity period

associated with the at least one content data" (see Goerke et al., Diagram on page 13, [page 15,

paragraph 1 and 5], [page 16, paragraph 1 and 2] and [page 17, paragraph 2] wherein inception

data combined with end data creates a validity period for a Plan data and Human Resource

Information System must include a database to maintain data as disclosed), comprising:

"receiving a notification during a first time period regarding a change in a validity period

of the at least one content data included in the record that is to be effected during a second time

period, wherein the first time period and the second time period are different" (see Goerke et al.,

[page 17, paragraph 4, 5 and 7] for the notification of change effected terms of the grant which is

considered as notification regarding change in a validity period of the grant data from a first time

period to second time period, as illustrated in Applicant's claim language);

"updating, based on the notification, the record by changing the validity period for the at

least one content data" (see Goerke et al., [page 17, paragraph 2 and 7] wherein the change from

the original expiration data to another data as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant's "changing

the validity period");

"extracting, at a periodic time interval, valid content data from the updated record, the

valid content data corresponding to content data being current at the time of extraction" (see

Goerke et al., [page 16, paragraph 1, 4, 7 and 8], and [page 17, paragraph 1-7]); and

"sending the file at the periodic time interval" (see Goerke et al., [page 19, paragraph 1],

[page 17, paragraph 1, 2, 6] and [page 16, paragraph 4 and 8]).

Goerke et al. does not teach:

"produce an internal document that includes the valid content data extracted from the

updated record"; and

"produce a file based on the internal document that includes the valid content".

Hanzek teaches:

"producing an internal document that includes the valid content data extracted from the updated record" (see Hanzek, [column 25, lines 55-67] and [column 26, lines 1-10] wherein a comma delimited flat file is equivalent to Applicant's "internal document"); and

"producing a file based on the internal document that includes the valid content" (see Hanzek, [column 26, lines 1-25] wherein an XML message or the converted file is equivalent to Applicant' "file").

It would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Goerke et al. by the teaching of Hanzek to add the features of producing an internal document and producing a file based on the internal document since these features provides an effective way to transfer data between different systems support different transport communication mechanisms (see Hanzek, [column 26, lines 10-16]).

As to claim 53, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 52 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Georke et al. and Hanzek teach:

"wherein the periodic time interval includes a day" (see Goerke et al., [page 16, paragraph 4] for the disclosure of regular exchange of data occurring each night).

As to claim 54, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 52 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Georke et al. and Hanzek teach:

"wherein the periodic time interval includes a week" (see <u>Goerke et al.</u>, [page 16, paragraph 4] for the disclosure of regular exchange of data occurring each night which anticipates 'the period time interval includes a week' as illustrated in <u>Applicant</u>'s claim language).

Conclusion

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CHARLES RONES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Phuong-Thao Cao
Art Unit 2164
August 23, 2007